

From the INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

PCT

NOTIFICATION CONCERNING
TRANSMITTAL OF COPY OF INTERNATIONAL
PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(CHAPTER I OF THE PATENT COOPERATION
TREATY)
(PCT Rule 44bis.1(c))

To:

DRAGSETH, John A.
Fish & Richardson P.C.
P.O. Box 1022
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440-1022
ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Date of mailing (*day/month/year*)

26 March 2009 (26.03.2009)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

16113-011WO1

IMPORTANT NOTICE

International application No.

PCT/US2006/026152

International filing date (*day/month/year*)

30 June 2006 (30.06.2006)

Priority date (*day/month/year*)

30 June 2005 (30.06.2005)

Applicant

GOOGLE INC. et al

The International Bureau transmits herewith a copy of the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

The International Bureau of WIPO
34, chemin des Colombettes
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70

Authorized officer

Yoshiko Kuwahara

e-mail: pt07.pct@wipo.int

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 16113-011WO1	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/US2006/026152	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 30 June 2006 (30.06.2006)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 30 June 2005 (30.06.2005)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant GOOGLE INC.			

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 *bis*.1(a).

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland		Date of issuance of this report 17 March 2009 (17.03.2009)
Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70		Authorized officer Yoshiko Kuwahara
Form PCT/IB/373 (January 2004)		e-mail: pt07.pct@wipo.int

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To: John A Dragseth
Fish & Richardson PC
PO Box 1022
Minneapolis, MN 55440-1022

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

11 FEB 2008

Applicant's or agent's file reference

16113-011WO1

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/US 06/26152

International filing date (day/month/year)

30 June 2006 (30.06.2006)

Priority date (day/month/year)

30 June 2005 (30.06.2005)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC(8) - G06F 3/00 (2007.01)

USPC - 715/700

Applicant

Google Inc

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:



Box No. I Basis of the opinion



Box No. II Priority



Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability



Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention



Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement



Box No. VI Certain documents cited



Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application



Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/US

Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Facsimile No. 571-273-3201

Date of completion of this opinion

08 July 2007 (08.07.2007)

Authorized officer:

Lee W. Young

PCT Helpdesk: 571-272-4300

PCT OSP: 571-272-7774

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US 06/26152

Box No. 1 Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
 - ☐ a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
 - ☐ on paper
 - ☐ in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US 06/26152

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	None	YES
	Claims	1-36	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	None	YES
	Claims	1-36	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-36	YES
	Claims	None	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-36 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by US 2003/0054830 A1 to Williams et al. (hereinafter 'Williams')

As for Claims 1 and 18, Williams teaches a computer-implemented method of providing text entry assistance data, comprising: receiving at a system location information associated with a user (para [0008]); receiving at the system information indicative of predictive textual outcomes (para [0031]); generating dictionary data using the location information (para [0034]); providing the dictionary data to a remote device (para [0034]); and a response formatter to receive information responsive to the data requests including predictive data entry information, and provide the information responsive to the data requests for use by the one or more clients (para [0033]).

As for Claim 2, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the received information indicative of predictive textual outcomes relates to search requests made by a plurality of remote searchers (para [0033]).

As for Claim 3, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the dictionary data comprises a plurality of terms with a corresponding plurality of predictive weightings (para [0031] and [0033]).

As for Claim 4, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising generating dictionary data using the information indicative of predictive textual outcomes (para [0031]).

As for Claim 5, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein providing the dictionary data to the remote device comprises transmitting the data to a mobile phone (para [0025]).

As for Claim 6, Williams teaches the method of claim 2, further comprising receiving user preferences that are used in searching based on the search requests (para [0033]).

As for Claim 7, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein generating the dictionary data comprises producing data related to the information indicative of the user location (para [0036]).

As for Claim 8, Williams teaches the method of claim 7, wherein the generated dictionary data is associated with places near the user location (para [0036]).

As for Claim 9, Williams teaches the method of claim 7, wherein the generated dictionary data is associated with common query data from users near the user location (para [0033]).

As for Claim 10, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the dictionary data is provided to the remote device in response to a request from the remote device (para [0033]).

As for Claim 11, Williams teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the request comprises a search request, and the dictionary data is provided along with results to the search request (para [0034]).

As for Claim 12, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising compressing the dictionary data before providing it to the remote device (para [0033]).

As for Claim 13, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the dictionary data comprises supplemental data for addition to a preexisting dictionary (para [0034]).

As for Claim 14, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving a search request, generating a search result, and providing the search result along with the dictionary data (para [0034]).

--(Continued in Supplemental Box)--

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US 06/26152

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

Box V, 2. Citations and explanations:

As for Claim 15, Williams teaches the method of claim 14, wherein the dictionary data comprises data from documents relating to the search result (para [0034]).

As for Claim 16, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the dictionary data includes data corresponding to one or more areas in a proximity of the user location (para [0034]).

As for Claim 17, Williams teaches the method of claim 16, wherein the data corresponding to one or more areas in the proximity of the user location comprises location names (para [0034]).

As for Claim 19, Williams teaches the system of claim 18, further wherein the request processor is operable to receive information indicative of a user location (para [0035]).

As for Claim 20, Williams teaches the system of claim 18, wherein the local search engine is operable to extract information indicative of a user location from the data requests (para [0037]).

As for Claim 21, Williams teaches the system of claim 18, wherein the dictionary generator comprises a concurrence rater that calculates predicted concurrence scores for a plurality of objects (para [0033]).

As for Claim 22, Williams teaches the system of claim 21, wherein the plurality of objects comprises a plurality of terms that may be entered by a user in generating a data request (para [0033]).

As for Claim 23, Williams teaches the system of claim 21, further comprising an object selector to identify objects in a document for submission to the concurrence rater (para [0033]).

As for Claim 24, Williams teaches the system of claim 18, wherein the local search engine is operable to receive a plurality of requests and information indicative of a user location and provides the requests for transmission by the response formatter along with predictive data entry information (para [0029]).

As for Claim 25, Williams teaches the system of claim 18, wherein the information for use by the one or more clients includes data corresponding to one or more areas in the proximity of the user location (para [0034]).

As for Claim 26, Williams teaches the system of claim 25, wherein the data corresponding to one or more areas in the proximity of the user location comprises location names (para [0034]).

As for Claim 27, Williams teaches a computer-implemented system for providing information indicative of probable usage of objects by the user of a data entry device, comprising:
means for providing documents associated with a user location and indicative of usage by a user or users (para [0033]);
a concurrence rater to analyze the documents for usage data of objects in the documents and to generate associated concurrence ratings (para [0033]); and
an interface to transmit the concurrence ratings to a data entry device (para [0033]).

As for Claim 28, Williams teaches the system of claim 27, wherein the concurrence rater further analyzes the documents for location data of the objects and generates concurrence ratings (para [0033]).

As for Claim 29, Williams teaches the system of claim 28, wherein the concurrence ratings are at least partially based on how far a location associated with the location data of the object is from the user location (para [0034][0031]).

As for Claim 30, Williams teaches the system of claim 27, wherein the concurrence ratings are at least partially based on preferences of a user (para [0033]).

As for Claim 31, Williams teaches a communication device, comprising:
a transceiver to receive and transmit information, wherein the transmitted information includes information indicative of a user location (para [0025]);
a vocabulary repository containing information indicative of the probable intended usage of ambiguous information entered by a user of the device, the occurrence data reflecting an association of the user location with the information indicative of the probable intended usage (para [0033]); and
a disambiguation engine to resolve the ambiguous information provided to the device to a probable solution by identifying possible solutions and to apply the information indicative of probable intended usage to the possible solutions (para [0031]).

—(Continued in Supplemental Box)—

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US 06/26152

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

Box V, 2. Citations and explanations:

As for Claim 32, Williams teaches the device of claim 31, further comprising a positioning system used to obtain the information indicative of the user location (para [0025]).

As for Claim 33, Williams teaches the device of claim 31, wherein a user inputs the information indicative of the user location (para [0031]).

As for Claim 34, Williams teaches the device of claim 31, wherein preferences of a user determine what information is contained in the vocabulary repository (para [0033]).

As for Claim 35, Williams teaches the device of claim 31, wherein the indicative information associated with the occurrence data is eliminated from the vocabulary repository when the occurrence data reaches a certain threshold (para [0033]).

As for Claim 36, Williams teaches the communication device of claim 31, wherein the occurrence data contains data that represents usage practices by members of a demographic group (para [0033]).

Claims 1-36 have industrial applicability as defined by PCT Article 33(4) because the subject matter can be made or used in industry.